REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action dated December 11, 2003, which has been made FINAL, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-16 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Cragun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,112) (hereinafter "Cragun"). With respect to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-16 as being anticipated by Cragun, applicant respectfully disagree in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Particularly, for clarification purposes, the present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1, 9 and 16 are being amended to set forth a system, method and computer product for customizing a Web page by using at least one computer on which a browser for browsing a Web page is executing.

In the rejection, the Examiner alleges that Cragun teaches a means for receiving a requested original web page (Figure 5 of Cragun) in which a program for customizing a page is embedded. In support of this, the Examiner cites Figure 5, element 129 as the "embedded" program. In an effort to clarify the language of Claims 1, 9 and 16, these claims are being amended to set forth respective means (and step) for embedding a customizing program in the requested original web page. This would remove any ambiguity with respect to the customizer program, particularly, how it is communicated, where it resides and is executed.

Respectfully, no new matter is being entered as full support for these amendments may be found in the present specification, e.g., page 8, lines 11-16 where it is described how a proxy server embeds the customizer program in an HTML web page.

The advantage of the embedding a customizer program in the web page according to the present invention is that the customizer can be implemented without changing existing web servers or web browsers, i.e., a standard web browser may be implemented, with no requirement of a browser plug-in or separate program logic. Further as claimed in Claims 7 and corresponding Claim 15, the program is executable independent of any operating system.

This is distinct from the presentation control mechanism described in Cragun (Figure 5, element 129). In Cragun, the presentation control mechanism is not embedded in the web page but, as described in the passage indicted by the Examiner at Col. 4, lines 34-42, the presentation control

6

mechanism is part of the web-browser, is another computer program in a computer system may be part of the operating system or, comprises a plug-in for the web browser. That is, Cragun's presentation control mechanism can not be realized with an existing web browser. That is, it appears necessary in Cragun to develop a new web browser in order to realize the customization mechanism available in Gragun.

In further distinction over Cragun, Claims 1, 9 and 16 of the present invention sets forth how the customization is separately stored, e.g. locally or via an attached server, without changing the original web page. These claims additionally set forth how the stored customization is dynamically restored when a user accesses the original web page. Moreover, the present invention describes the customizer's structure and technical details. According to the structure described, the customizer of the present invention can be implemented without changing existing web servers, web browsers, and or web pages.

Clearly, the Cragun reference does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims as now amended with the clarifying limitation. As the clarified limitation is neither taught nor suggested in Cragun, Claims 1, 9 and 16 can not be invalid over 35 U.S.C. §102(e) grounds.

Further to this, with respect to the rejection of Claim 18 which sets forth that the customizing operation according to the invention is performed "without changing an existing web server providing said original Web page or said web browser", Applicants respectfully fail to see how the cited passage in Cragun (Col. 11, lines 2-3) teaches this limitation. Clearly, the operation of the Cragun's presentation control mechanism is a separate program resident in the web-browser (thus modifying the web browser as shown in Figure 5) or, is a browser plug-in as indicated in Cragun at Col. 4, lines 34-42.

In further distinction, with respect to the final rejection of Claims 7 and 15, which set forth the execution of the customizer program independent of any operating system or web browser, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's reliance on the cited passage in Cragun (Col. 11, lines 20-22) is misplaced. The cited passage in Cragun refers to the "users" of the system which may comprise human users, computer functions or software programs. This is not anticipatory of a customizer program executable independent of any operating system or web browser.

In light of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-16 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Cragun.

G:\Ibm\105\12819\amend\12819.AM2.doc

It is thus respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
SF:gc

8

G:\Ibm\105\12819\amend\12819.AM2.doc